```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                           DISTRICT OF OREGON
 8
 9
                           PORTLAND DIVISION
10
11
                                                 No. 3:12-cv-00405-HU
12
  EVAN JENSEN,
13
             Plaintiff,
                                                         FINDINGS AND
                                                       RECOMMENDATION
14
        V.
15
  OMNI CREDIT SERVICES OF
   FLORIDA, INC.,
16
             Defendant.
17
18
  HUBEL, Magistrate Judge:
19
        Plaintiff Evan Jensen ("Plaintiff") moves for entry of default
20
  judgment in the amount of $4,645 against Defendant Omni Credit
21 Services of Florida, Inc. ("Defendant") pursuant to Federal Rule of
22 Civil Procedure ("Rule") 55(b). Plaintiff seeks statutory damages
23 stemming from Defendant's alleged violation of the Fair Debt
24 Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq., and
25 for attorney fees and costs. For the reasons set forth below, the
26 court recommends granting Plaintiff's motion (Docket No. 10) for
27 default judgment.
28 ///
  Page 1 - FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
```

Case 3:12-cv-00405-HU Document 12 Filed 02/25/13 Page 1 of 5

Background

1

2

3

5

9

11

12

13

15

16

18

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff's complaint, filed on March 7, 2012, contains a single cause of action for violation of the FDCPA based on Defendant's attempts collect а debt from Plaintiff. to Specifically, Plaintiff claims that Defendant caused his "telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff, including calling Plaintiff repeatedly about a debt belonging to 'Patricia Burr.'" (Compl.  $\P$  9.) Plaintiff informed Defendant that "his number d[id] not belong to Patricia Burr," Defendant allegedly "ignored this information and continued to harass Plaintiff with further calls" in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5). (Compl.  $\P$  9.)

Charles Mathias, the clerk on duty in the office of Defendant's registered agent, was served personally on March 9, 2012. (Aff. Serv. at 1.) Defendant failed to move or plead in response to Plaintiff's complaint. See FED. R. CIV. P. 12(a)(1)(A). As a result, Plaintiff filed a motion (Docket No. 7) for entry of default on October 4, 2012, and the undersigned entered a default order on October 24, 2012, (Docket 9). The present motion for default judgment followed soon thereafter.

## Analysis

Under Rule 55(b), the court may enter default judgment against defendant who has failed to plead or otherwise defend an action. The "court's decision whether to enter default judgment is a discretionary one." Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089, 1092 (9th Cir. 1980). In exercising its discretion, the court may consider

(1) the possibility of prejudice to the plaintiff, (2) the merits of plaintiff's substantive claim, (3) the sufficiency of the complaint, (4) the sum of money at

Page 2 - FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

stake in the action; (5) the possibility of a dispute concerning material facts; (6) whether the default was due to excusable neglect, and (7) the strong policy underlying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure favoring decisions on the merits.

1

2

3

5

9

18

20

23

24

26

Eitel v. McCool, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir. 1986). assessing the Eitel factors, "all factual allegations in the complaint are taken as true, except those with regard to damages." Ortega v. Griggs & Assocs., LLC, No. 5:11-cv-02235, 2012 WL 2913202, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2012).

Here, the Eitel factors weigh in favor of entering default judgment against Defendant. First, Plaintiff would undoubtedly be 11 prejudiced if default judgment were not granted because Plaintiff 12 would otherwise be without a remedy against an allegedly abusive 13 debt collector. Second, Plaintiff has adequately alleged a 14 violation of the FDCPA. Section 1692d(5) explicitly prohibits debt collects from "[c]ausing a telephone to ring or engaging any person 16 in telephone conversation repeatedly or continuously with intent to 17 annoy, abuse, or harass any person at the called number." U.S.C. § 1692d(5). Third, the sum of money at stake in this action is relatively small. Fourth, there is no indication that Defendant's failure to respond was the result of excusable neglect. 21 Fifth and finally, in cases such as this one, "the policy behind the FDCPA favors entry of default." Ortega, 2012 WL 2913202, at \*4.

Rule 54(c) governs the scope of relief granted, which in the 25 case of a default judgment "must not differ in kind from, or exceed in amount, what is demanded in the pleadings." FED. R. CIV. P. 54(c). "To recover damages after securing a default judgment, a 28 plaintiff must prove the relief it seeks through testimony or

Page 3 - FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

written affidavit." Monroe v. Steinfeld, No. C-11-2726, 2012 WL 1496204, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2012) (collecting cases).

2

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff seeks recovery totaling \$4,645, consisting of (1) 3 statutory damages in the amount of \$1,000; (2) attorney fees in the amount of \$3,255; and (3) \$390 in costs for filing this suit. Where, as here, a debt collector fails to comply with the FDCPA's provisions, it is liable for statutory damages not to exceed \$1,000. 15 U.S.C. \$ 1692k(a)(2)(A). The FDCPA also directs courts 9 to award reasonable attorney fees and costs to prevailing consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3). The attorney fees sought by 11 Plaintiff "in this matter consist of 11.1 hours of time billed by attorney Joshua Trigsted at \$250/hr. and 4 hours of paralegal Terri Parrish at \$120/hr., for a total of \$3,255.00." (Trigsted Decl. 13 Supp. Mot. Default at 2.) In the court's view, the rate requested and time expended by Plaintiff's counsel are reasonable. 15

## Conclusion

For the reasons state herein, Plaintiff's motion (Docket No. 10) for default judgment should be granted. Plaintiff should be awarded (1) statutory damages in the amount of \$1,000; (2) attorney fees totaling \$3,255; and (3) costs amounting to \$390.

## Scheduling Order

The Findings and Recommendation will be referred to a district judge. Objections, if any, are due March 18, 2013. If no objections are filed, then the Findings and Recommendation will go under advisement on that date. If objections are filed, then a response is due April 4, 2013. When the response is due or filed,

Page 4 - FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

## Case 3:12-cv-00405-HU Document 12 Filed 02/25/13 Page 5 of 5

1 whichever date is earlier, the Findings and Recommendation will go under advisement. Dated this 25th day of February, 2013. /s/ Dennis J. Hubel DENNIS J. HUBEL United States Magistrate Judge Page 5 - FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION